

UNCLASSIFIED		SECRET	
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	Deputy Director for Support 7 D 26 Headquarters	2 MAY 1972	RAW/ms
2			
3	Executive Director-Comptroller 7 D 59 Headquarters	5 May	WEC/ae
4	EX DIR COMMENT NOTED B A/DDS	5/10/72	
5	Director of Personnel	11 MAY 1972	HBF
6	DD Pers / P.C.	7/24	osm
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE

Remarks:

⑦ Chief, Plans Staff

I learned this date from OLC that the Sub-Committee on Children and Youth of the Senate Labor Committee reported out a new Bill which would authorize Federal agencies to establish day care centers. The Bill does not contain any provision limiting the authorization of such a facility to low-income families.

The Committee is expected to act upon the proposed legislation within the week.

Ex Dir thought this to be an excellent study.
Take a bow!

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER


FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.		DATE
Director of Personnel, 5 E 56 Hdqs.		1 MAY 1972
UNCLASSIFIED		SECRET

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller

Bill:

While this study comes out with a "not now" conclusion, I think it is a pretty thorough piece of work and will be a good starting point should the Agency decide to go.



Robert S. Wattles

, 2 MAY 1972

(DATE)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

1 MAY 1972

Executive Registry
72-229/1

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller

THROUGH

: Deputy Director for Support

2 MAY 1972

SUBJECT

: Day Care Center

1. Pursuant to your request, I conducted a survey of the advantages and problems involved in the establishment of an Agency-operated or sponsored day care center. To assist me in this effort, I appointed an Office of Personnel committee to consider the various ramifications of the proposal.

2. In conversations with the OPPB and representatives of the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare, it became apparent to the committee that OMB will not currently support agency requests for authorization or appropriation of funds to establish and maintain Federal day care programs. Legislation authorizing such facilities was recently passed by Congress but vetoed by the President. Accordingly, the question of whether or not the Agency should establish a day care center cannot be answered until such time as it is decided if Federal agencies will be authorized to provide day care facilities as a matter of public policy.

3. Appropriately, however, the study committee submitted a report on its deliberations. It contains a number of guidelines for consideration if and when the situation permits reactivation of the day care proposal. Since Congress is currently seeking to arrive at an acceptable basis for enactment of authorizing legislation, Federal day care centers could become a live issue again. If so, the committee's report should be utilized as a starting point in framing a specific proposal.

4. A copy of the committee's report is attached.



Harry B. Fisher
Director of Personnel

FOIAB3B

Att

25X1A9A

(Attachment provided to
instructions)

/OCI on 4 May 1972 per ExDir's

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

DAY CARE CENTER: NOT NOW; PERHAPS LATER

Summary

- Establishment of an Agency day care center or centers cannot be accomplished at this time. OMB has indicated it would not sanction the use of appropriated funds for this purpose. Contacts with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare indicate they have received the same response from OMB.
- Last session, the Congress passed legislation conferring authority on Federal agencies to establish Federal day care centers, but it was not approved by the President. Congress is currently re-examining the legislation in an effort to arrive at a mutually acceptable proposal.
- If legislation is enacted authorizing Federal day care centers as a matter of national policy, this Agency should actively consider the establishment of one to three centers (depending upon the results of a survey showing actual employee interest in using such facilities). The Agency should avoid the problems experienced by HEW and DOL in maintaining longer waiting lists than participants in their day care programs.
- Federal day care centers have been advocated as means of reducing personal anxieties, turnover and absenteeism, while helping recruitment and increasing employee dependability and productivity. These factors are probably true to some degree, although hard evidence is lacking that substantial improvements will occur in exchange for the major outlays involved. (In the Federal agencies that now operate day care centers, only a small part of the on-duty-strength is affected.)
- If Federal day care centers are authorized within the next year or so, the findings of this report and the reference materials collected in its preparation should be used as points of departure in developing a specific Agency proposal. The following guidelines are recommended:
 - Emphasize the increased hiring of black employees and the child care of their dependents.
 - Provide developmental care and programmed activity for children three years of age and older.
 - Establish day care centers as close as possible to places of employment at Headquarters and in the Washington Area.
 - Hire a fully professional day care specialist to manage the Center. Consider hiring employees' wives as teachers, aids, and other staff members.
 - To enhance employee assistance and employment stability, maintain a resource within the center or centers for temporarily taking care of employee dependents when employees having private care arrangements are unexpectedly confronted by emergencies or disruptions in service.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Findings and Observations

Day Care Is a Growing Phenomenon

Almost everyone has observed, directly or indirectly, the problems of working parents; e.g., finding a suitable person or group with whom they can entrust their children; deciding the economic advantages of working or not working; and facing the disruptions that occur when illness strikes, dissensions arise, costs go up, services are temporarily unavailable, or children are unhappy.

These are long-standing difficulties that traditionally have been regarded as the private concerns of individuals, with no particular significance for employers or society. Within the last few years, however, social and economic changes have precipitated a new focus. Today the phrase day care center has become a household term, albeit with much confusion as to meaning, structure, cost and purposes. As minority groups -- women and the economically disadvantaged -- seek to enter the market place in ever-increasing numbers, they are finding the care of their children a necessary first step; employers are looking more and more to day care centers as devices for maintaining a stable work force; and public administrators are actively debating the desirability of day care facilities as instruments of educational improvement and welfare reform.

Within the past year, differences between the administration and the Congress prevented the enactment of legislation providing for a big increase in the number of day care centers throughout the United States, including authority for the establishment of Federal agency day care centers. Whether or not these differences will be resolved is conjectural, but efforts are being made currently within the Congress to reconcile apparent problems.

Some Basic Points to Consider in Deciding Upon the Feasibility
of a Federal Day Care Center

On the assumption that enabling legislation for Federal DCC's could become a reality within the next few years, some initial thinking about the possible value of an Agency DCC is worthwhile. As a beginning, certain overall object lessons can be gained from the day care movement to date. First, there are recognized professional day care standards but no popular consensus regarding the required elements of a desirable program. In everyday usage, the term DCC is employed to describe facilities varying from kindergartens, offering highly programmed activities, to drop-off babysitting pools. Second, child day care centers of an order above the level of custodial care are expensive, often averaging \$2000 to \$2500 per child annually. Third, a fully developmental child care program is a highly individualized task, entailing the maintenance of a

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

low teacher/child ratio and a professional staff of day care specialists, teachers, doctors and other supportive professionals and educational techniques. Fourth, the pre-school development of children is a major responsibility and trust that can be best accomplished by keeping the total number of children in a DCC within a reasonable limit (50-60 is a recognized norm) and by arranging for children of like age to be together in classes approximating 10-15 persons. Fifth, Federal day care center planning should take into account state and local regulations and Federal interagency day care requirements relating to type of program, ages of children, size of groups, safety and sanitation standards, suitability of physical facilities, educational and programmed activities, health and nutrition services, parental involvement and periodic program evaluation. Sixth, employment of a director skilled in pre-school child education and management is a key factor in insuring the success of a day care program.

The Case for Infant Care Versus Pre-School Care Is Arguable

Day care specialists and child educators generally agree that day care facilities should offer developmental programs to children age three and above and less structured but highly individualized care to two year olds. Few child care specialists advocate handling infants or children under two years of age within day care centers; yet, it is this latter group of children that often represents the major child care need for working families. In the Committee's visits to the DCC's at HEW and Fort Meade, we were informed that the number one need expressed by employee mothers is infant care. Moreover, from the standpoint of advantages to the Government; e.g., reduced turnover and absenteeism, infant care has the greatest potential benefit. The existence of a care program allowing an employee to return to work and enroll her dependent in a DCC after the child becomes two years old would be less attractive than a day care program allowing the enrollment of infants and the return of the mother to work after a limited interval of time. In addition, the demands upon working mothers to meet sudden or emergency problems are greater in caring for infants than for children two or more years of age.

Quite aside from employee needs and potential and Government advantages, the problems of managing an infant center are significantly different in terms of requirements, attention and handling than pre-school day care centers. Obviously, the care and feeding of infant children; e.g., before they are toilet-trained, should be undertaken only for clear and compelling reasons; and we believe there are none justifying this approach. Nevertheless, a care program should allow some one-year-old children to be enrolled in the program if it is to fully serve the basic purposes justifying the existence of a Federal day care service.

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

Federal Agencies that Have Care Programs or Have Considered Them

HEW and the Department of Labor are the best known Federal agencies with quality care centers, each having about 60 children. Each utilizes the services of a contractor to provide the program but furnishes the physical plant. The Department of Agriculture has a small custodial program at Beltsville (under 20 children), and it developed a proposal in 1970 to establish a center that would accommodate 40-50 children. Several other agencies have considered the establishment of a DCC, among them the Department of State, the Department of Commerce and the National Security Agency.

Authorization and Funding of Federal DCC's Are Currently Restricted

HEW and DOL instituted their programs by the use of manpower development and educational project funds available by separate statute to these agencies. DOL has functioned with demonstration funds since 1968, and HEW has used this funding method for two years. Both have attempted within the past year to gain OMB's approval to include future costs as line items in their budgets but OMB has declined to do so. In an interview with the project manager of the HEW Center, we learned that a HEW interdepartmental committee representing several offices of the Department was hopeful of an affirmative answer preliminary to creating their own programs. OMB's declination now poses serious problems for HEW and DOL inasmuch as their use of demonstration funds (as a model for state and local programs) is a temporary expedient that cannot be continued indefinitely.

A representative of the Department of Agriculture likewise has confirmed the reluctance of OMB to support the use of appropriated funds for a Federal day care center. Its proposal, estimated to cost about \$350,000 during the first year (including renovation of the property) was rejected, and DOA is no longer actively pursuing the matter at this time.

A check with the Office of General Counsel and OPPB reinforces the findings encountered elsewhere in attempts to obtain funds for operation of a DCC. It is clear at this juncture that the Agency has no authority to use appropriated funds to establish or maintain a day care center, and OMB is apparently not disposed to support appropriation requests in the absence of new authorizing legislation.

The Stated Purposes of a Federal DCC Are Apparent But Not Fully Supportable

Attendant to HEW's responsibilities for child development and child education, it perceived the value of a model center as a showcase for experimentation and subsequent emulation in the states and localities. It also sought to justify the program on the grounds of less turnover, less absenteeism and better employee performance. HEW believes these objectives have been realized and well received by employees, but clear

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

evidence of the advantages to the Government is lacking. HEW hopes an evaluation of the program will produce verifying data.

DOL has supported its operation for essentially the same reasons; i.e., an experimental project to increase job opportunities for young mothers; service to its employees; and advantages to the Government, such as less leave-taking, less turnover, increased productivity, higher employee job interest and stability, and general improvement in job performance. Again, the record of statistically significant advantages to the Government is not readily seen. In a 1971 report, the DCC Evaluation Committee stated that DOL's record in meeting its objectives three years after inception of the program was terribly low. Inter alia, it stated (a) the Department has not actively recruited employees from the inner-city poverty areas since 1968 and the DCC has played no part in recruitment of childless clericals and professionals; (b) spot checks on the absenteeism and turnover of employees using the DCC were spotty; and (c) no attempt has been made to measure dollar gains. Putting it simply, the report concluded that DOL had failed to meet its original objectives and recommended new ones, namely, aid employee stabilization (less absenteeism and turnover) and provide an employer-sponsored day care model to public and private employees.

DOL did a T&A audit of 70 users, past and present, and a 50-person control group. From a statistical standpoint, results were not very significant. DOL also asked participants in the DCC and their supervisors to express opinions on the value of the service and its effects upon employee dependability, productivity, etc. Supervisors were overwhelmingly in favor of the center. (Four of five noted improvement in employee performance, and over one-half reported less absenteeism.)

Little Hard Evidence That an Agency DCC
Would Substantially Reduce Leave and Turnover or Improve Recruitment

We presume that some fewer absences and some greater employee dependability and increased organizational loyalty would result from the establishment of an Agency-sponsored facility, and we expect that these gains would result in an increased measure of employee productivity among those involved. We suspect, however, that the tangible advantages to the Government are not pronounced.

To test the issue of absenteeism and employee dependability, we compared the leave records in FY 1971 of 80 female employees with dependents and child care problems versus 80 female employees without children of like grades (otherwise picked at random). After deducting the amount of maternity leave taken by the women with dependents, extended to them as a matter of Agency policy, we found that the average amount of leave taken during FY 1971 by the two groups of women was identical (221 hours). The average amount of LWOP was virtually the same in the two groups. Those with children took a little more sick leave and a little less annual leave. Since there was no distinction in the leave taking of

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

females with and without children, these findings suggest that the existence or non-existence of an Agency DCC versus some other care arrangement is irrelevant.

We felt the need to obtain a better understanding of the potential effect an Agency DCC would have in reducing employee turnover. Since no relevant statistical data were available, we decided to solicit the opinions of employees who resigned in CY 1971 and 1972 after maternity leave concerning whether or not an Agency day care center would have affected their decision to resign. Thirty-one of the 78 respondents indicated their resignation was primarily caused by the lack of a local child care service. Twenty-seven employees said they would have returned to work if an Agency DCC had been available. The questionnaire produced some interesting responses aside from the key issue on its value as a deterrent to employee turnover (see Tab A). Two-thirds of the ex-employees commented favorably regarding the establishment of an Agency center and some were pleased the Agency would consider such a program. For example, one person remarked that this was another example of how the Agency takes such good care of its people.

The Committee also reviewed 406 pre-exit interviews of clerical employees who resigned between January 1971 and February 1972 in an effort to judge the applicability of child care problems to separations. Admittedly, the reports were often abbreviated, but only 17 of the 406 employees indicated to the interviewers that young children entered into their decision to quit.

From these fragmentary data, operation of an Agency day care center should reduce turnover, but the volume is unclear. We suspect not more than 50 clericals a year would be saved out of 800-900 losses if both Agency-sponsored infant and pre-school child care were made available to all those employees interested in these activities.

The Agency is not experiencing any shortage in clerical or professional applicants that would constitute a rationale for substantial Government day care expenditures. We are appreciative, however, of the Agency's declared intention to improve its recruitment of black personnel -- a factor that is in accord with public policy. We are mindful that emphasis on the increased recruitment of higher graded black professionals is the Agency's primary goal. Notwithstanding, the distance of Headquarters from the inner-city and the difficulties black employees experience in finding proximate day care facilities in the Virginia area are points that should be considered carefully in any future consideration of an Agency DCC proposal.

An Agency Employee Questionnaire on the Establishment of an Agency DCC Shows Considerable Employee Interest

We were reluctant to inventory the present or prospective interests that all female employees have in the establishment of an Agency DCC for

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

a number of reasons. They include the fear of awakening expectations that might not be fulfilled; the difficulty of formulating a specific proposal in advance of a detailed study of the subject; and the presumed legal and funding uncertainties obscuring the Agency's current capability to institute such a program. We perceived the advantage, however, of assessing the experiences and advice of employees who have or have had an actual knowledge of child care problems. Accordingly, we conducted a survey of 237 parents in the Agency relative to their present arrangements and the advantages an Agency DCC might have.

Detailed results of the survey are contained in Tab B. Some major findings are summarized below.

About three-fourths of the respondents use a custodial or babysitting service, rather than kindergarten or a facility having structured programmed activities.

Over two-thirds require between five to ten hours of daily care.

About one-half pay a weekly cost between \$20 to \$30 (about one-fifth between \$10 to \$20 and one-fifth over \$30).

One-half utilize a facility or person located less than one mile from home; three-fourths use a facility over five miles from home. ~~WORK~~.

Four-fifths of the respondents drop off their children between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m., and three-fourths pick up their children before 6:00 p.m.

Additional time required for transportation to and from the day care facility varied substantially, with almost one-half acknowledging 10-20 additional minutes were required.

In commenting on the advantages of their present arrangements, several reasons were given, including proximity, reliability, good care, economy and educational value. Proximity was the most important reason cited (one-third).

Disadvantages of present facilities were also multiple in number, with the "lack of constant availability" most often mentioned among the reasons (one-fourth). Poor location, expense and inadequate care were also frequently noted.

Three-fourths expressed no difficulty in traveling to and from home, the location of the care facility, and the office. Almost one-fifth mentioned problems of being late to work or having to leave earlier than sometimes desired.

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

Despite the fact most of the respondents use custodial or babysitting arrangements, 90 percent showed a preference for programmed activity versus custodial care. (The question may have been poorly phrased or likely to invoke an automatic response.)

When asked about the possible advantages of an Agency-sponsored DCC, respondents gave several reasons, but one-half commented on the advantages of proximity and continuous or permanent coverage.

Although many separate ideas were offered as to the preferred age groups to be included in an Agency DCC program, one-half suggested infants and above should be included, and one-fourth proposed children age two and above.

Our inquiry about the appropriate distance for locating an Agency DCC in relation to the work site elicited replies in both minutes and miles. Over one-fourth suggested the Agency premises; about one-fourth recommended no more than 10-15 minutes away; and about one-fourth proposed no more than five miles away.

The questionnaire sought to ascertain an appropriate charge for custodial, programmed activity and kindergarten facilities respectively. Although the respondents showed a willingness to pay more for developmental care, the difference was a matter of degree. For custodial care, two-fifths were willing to pay under \$20 and two-fifths were agreeable to \$20-\$25. Acceptable charges for programmed activity and kindergarten were fairly comparable (about two-fifths in each case suggested \$20-\$30).

The Number and Location of an Agency DCC or DCC's
Should Fit the Need for Care

Both HEW and DOL have long waiting lines of employees desiring to use their DCC's. This discrepancy between the potential audience to be served versus the limited number that can be served raises serious reservations about the efficacy of these programs in meeting Government objectives and employee needs. Employee morale of the few is maintained at the expense of the many. The problem is accentuated by the tendency for children of employees who succeeded in getting into the program to remain in the DCC for several years, thereby monopolizing the service and limiting the number of new openings.

We were impressed by the vigor of the statement made by HEW representatives that a DCC should be located near the work site. For example, the Director of the Center gave his opinion that the quality care C&P Center in Anacostia is not being used as expected because of its location.

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

The location of Agency personnel in several different buildings within the Metropolitan Washington Area poses a special problem that should be carefully evaluated in deciding upon the need and cost of Agency-sponsored day care facilities. As cases in point, on-duty-strength a few months ago was about [REDACTED]

25X1

If and when active consideration is given to the establishment of an Agency DCC, a density population study should be made showing the location of Agency personnel and a survey should be conducted reflecting actual employee interest in using a DCC. The responses are critical to reaching any final conclusions on the specific elements of a proposal. According to our preliminary judgment, it appears probable that a suitable program would involve about 120-150 spaces in two or three centers of about 50-60 children, located near Headquarters, Rosslyn or perhaps elsewhere.

Alternative Child Care Arrangements to an Agency-Sponsored DCC
Do Not Appear Feasible

Legal and funding constraints and the administrative complexities of managing an effective day care program that is conducive to the proper development of children are sufficiently formidable to warrant consideration of other alternatives to an Agency-run day care facility.

We considered the possibility of an employees' association center or centers, but concluded the idea is not a viable option. As noted, the Office of Logistics confirmed there is no space available on Agency premises, and the Office of General Counsel informed us that appropriated funds cannot be diverted to an employees' association for the purpose of acquiring property and building or leasing a DCC facility any more than it could directly expend funds for this purpose. The costs entailed in operating one or more DCC's and acquiring land and structures appear to be too large an outlay to handle from current fee collections.

The Committee investigated the availability of private day care centers near the Headquarters building. Only two, Happy Hill School, 6418 Georgetown Road, and Falls Church-McLean Day Care Center, 2036 Westmoreland Drive, were advertised. It has been reported to us that getting into these facilities can be difficult.

We checked the possibility of acquiring a reduced rate for a group of Agency employees, even though the Committee appreciated that cover or security problems might limit the applicability of this approach even if available. Our inquiry did not disclose any private day care facility or school that offers a lowered group rate. (Reductions for more than one child from the same family are common.)

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

Conclusions

Legal and budgetary prohibitions or constraints make further Agency overtures to OMB inadvisable and unproductive pending determination of future national policy governing the establishment of Federal day care centers.

If the Federal Government enacts general legislation within the next year or two authorizing the establishment of Federal day care centers, the Agency should carefully evaluate the applicability to CIA of the objectives stated in the legislation and the value of increasing the employment of minorities via the origin of a day care program.

We hope this report and other source materials that we have collected can be used as starting points if and when authorizing legislation is passed.

The Agency should avoid the mistake made by HEW and DOL of providing day care facilities that are inadequate to meet employee interests.

Barring an unexpected change in noted patterns of leave, turnover and clerical recruitment in the Agency, prospective improvements in these areas are likely to be of insufficient magnitude to justify the major expenditure of funds for two or three DCC's probably required to meet employee needs.

Although the maintenance of a day care center or centers would provide a desirable employee service or benefit, this factor does not constitute a sufficient reason to open one or more DCC's.

We believe any future action to develop a specific DCC proposal should be undertaken in consonance with the following guidelines:

a. Establish DCC facilities as close as possible to places of employment, according to the relative density of the work force and the volume of employee interest.

b. Provide developmental care for children age three and above.

c. Hire an experienced day care specialist and manager to run the DCC facilities and consider the utilization of employee wives on a part-time or full-time basis to fill other staffing requirements; e.g., teachers, teaching aids, nurses and kitchen helpers.

d. Unless future enabling legislation authorizes Federal assistance to low-income groups, fix and charge fees that do not differentiate among family income groups but allow for a reduction in fees when two or more children from the same family are enrolled in a center.

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

e. Maintain a temporary custodial care capability within the DCC; e.g., a week's duration to assist employees experiencing temporary interruptions or lapses in their private child care arrangements. (The availability of this resource may prove to be the principal means of accomplishing increased employee dependability.)

Approved For Release 2002/11/04 : CIA-RDP79-00235A000100040001-6

REPLIES OF 78 EX-EMPLOYEES WHO RESIGNED FOLLOWING MATERNITY LEAVE
TO AN AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE ON DAY CARE

Did you resign primarily because of the lack of available local child
care service?

Yes 31

No 47

If your answer is yes, please complete the following:*

Would you have returned to work if an infant day care center
(under two years old) had been provided by the Agency?

Yes 27

No 16

At what minimum age would you have considered enrolling a child
in an infant day care center?

Under 12 months 24

One year or over 24

Would the availability of an Agency-sponsored pre-school day care
center (ages two through five) have enabled you to return to duty?

Yes 29

No 13

What would be your preference for the location of a day care
center?

Near home 10

Near work 37

What do you consider to be an appropriate weekly charge for an
Agency-sponsored day care center?

Up to \$15 12

\$20 12

\$25 14

\$30 and over 2

Do you favor the establishment of an Agency day care center?

Yes 54

No comment 24

* Some of those answering no to the first question participated in the
second phase of the questionnaire, even though they were not requested
to do so.

REPLIES OF 237 RESPONDENTS (WITH DEPENDENTS)
TO AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE ON DAY CARE

I. Responses Relating to Their Private Day Care Arrangements

<u>Person or Facility Providing Child Care</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Relative	15%
Friend/Neighbor	57%
Kindergarten or Day Care Center	28%
	100%
<u>Type of Care</u>	
Custodial or babysitting	71%
Programmed Activities	18%
Kindergarten	11%
	100%
<u>Total Daily Hours of Care</u>	
Under 5	9%
5 - 10	69%
Over 10	22%
	100%
<u>Weekly Cost</u>	
Under \$10	4%
\$10-\$19	23%
\$20-\$30	55%
Over \$30	18%
	100%
<u>Distance of Care Location from Home</u>	
Under 1 mile	50%
1 - 5 miles	35%
Over 5 miles	15%
	100%

Distance of Care Location from Work

Percent

Under 1 mile	2%
1 - 5 miles	19%
Over 5 miles	79%
	<hr/>
	100%

Morning Drop-Off Time

Before 7 a.m.	8%
7 a.m. - 8 a.m.	80%
Other	12%
	<hr/>
	100%

Evening Pick-Up Time

Before 6 p.m.	74%
6 p.m. - 7 p.m.	26%
	<hr/>
	100%

Additional Time in Transit Occasioned by Child Care Arrangements

Under 10 minutes	47%
10 - 20 minutes	46%
21 - 30 minutes	5%
Over 30 minutes	2%
	<hr/>
	100%

Advantages of Present Arrangement

Proximity	32%
Reliability	8%
Good care	13%
Care at home	6%
Inexpensive	6%
Other playmates	8%
Educational value	10%
Individualized attention	4%
Good meals	5%
Others	8%
	<hr/>
	100%

<u>Disadvantages of Present Arrangement</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Not always available (illness of sitter, summer vacation, etc.)	24%
Lack of permanency	3%
Poor location	12%
Expensive	10%
Conflicting hours between work and care facility (including the fact cannot work overtime)	7%
Exposure to illness	3%
Inadequate care or educational facilities	9%
Others	8%
None	24%
	<hr/>
	100%

Problems Getting To and From Locations on Time

None	72%
Yes (personal problems, but no office problems)	5%
Personal and office problems:	
Time off	1%
Conflicting hours or cannot work overtime	3%
Necessary to arrive late or leave early	19%
	<hr/>
	100%

Problems from Previous Terminations of Care Arrangements

None	45%
Previous termination, but no office problems	29%
Office problems resulting from termination:	
Resignation	2%
Necessary to arrive late or leave early	2%
Time Off	21%
Others	1%
	<hr/>
	100%

II. Responses Relating to the Establishment of an Agency Day Care Center or Centers

Preference for Programmed Activities rather than Custodial Care

Yes	90%
No difference	10%
	<hr/>

<u>Advantages of Agency Day Care Center</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Proximity	31%
Continuous and permanent coverage	24%
Infant care	4%
Inexpensive	12%
Quality care	14%
Comparable hours (work and day care center)	3%
Others	5%
None	7%
	<hr/>
	100%

<u>Preferred Age Groups to be Included</u>	
1 and above	16%
2 and above	27%
Infants and above	52%
Other	5%
	<hr/>
	100%

<u>Desired Distance of Care from Work</u>	
On premises or near	29%
Lapsed travel-time in minutes:	
Under 10	15%
10 - 15	26%
16 - 20	2%
30 and over	2%
Lapsed travel-time in miles:	
Under 5 miles	25%
6 - 10 miles	1%
	<hr/>
	100%

<u>Appropriate Weekly Charge for Day Care</u>	
Custodial care:	
Under \$20	43%
\$20 - \$24	42%
\$25 - \$29	13%
\$30 - \$34	1%
\$35 and over	1%
	<hr/>
	100%

	<u>Percent</u>
Programmed Activities/Pre-Kindergarten:	
Under \$20	19%
\$20 - \$24	20%
\$25 - \$29	40%
\$30 - \$34	15%
\$35 and over	6%
	<hr/>
	100%
Kindergarten:	
Under \$20	13%
\$20 - \$24	31%
\$25 - \$29	27%
\$30 - \$34	16%
\$35 and over	13%
	<hr/>
	100%

REFERENCE MATERIALS USED IN DAY CARE STUDY

Memo dtd 5 Jan 72 fr Junior Officer Informal Study Group, subj: A Day Care Center for CIA

"Notes from Interview of Mrs. Linda Louderbach, Personnel Coordinator, Department of Labor, Re Department of Labor Child Care Center," prepared by Junior Officer Informal Study Group

25X9A8

"Final Report on DOL Day Care Center," prepared by Program Evaluation Committee, December 1971

"Notes of Conversation with Mr. [] Chief, Benefits and Services, NSA, 4 February 1972," prepared by OP Day Care Committee

"Notes of Conversation with Mrs. [] Directress, Fort Meade Day Care Center, 4 February 1972," prepared by OP Day Care Committee

"Notes of Interview with Mr. Harold Burman, Assistant Deputy Legal Advisor for Administration, Department of State," prepared by Junior Officer Informal Study Group

25X9A8

Department of State memo dtd 23 November 1971 to Mr. Joseph Donnelan fr Harold Burman, subj: Proposed Day Care Facilities for Employee Dependents: Availability of S&E Appropriation

Department of State memo dtd 8 December 1971 to Mr. Joseph Donnelan fr Harold Burman, subj: L/M Memorandum of 23 November 1971 Concerning S&E Availability for Proposed Day Care Facilities: Necessity for Prior Appropriations Committee Consideration

Memo to All Commerce Supervisors in Washington Metropolitan Area fr Larry A. Jobe, subj: Child Day Care, Department of Commerce

"Fact Sheet on the Department of Agriculture Day Care Center at Beltsville"

Memo dtd 6 November 1970 to Department of Agriculture Day Care Committee fr Linley E. Juers, Deputy Administrator, Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture, subj: Child Day Care

"Questionnaire to all Employees of DOA" from Chairman, USDA Study Committee on Day Care, dtd 28 May 1970, subj: All Persons Interested in Child Day Care

"USDA Child Care Center Budgetary Proposal" dtd 7 October 1971

National Capital Area Child Day Care Association materials (including "Narrative Summary of Program Elements," "Standard Budget of a Day Care Center for 30-35 Children," "Staff Job Descriptions," and Regulations Governing Operation of Day Care Center and Educational Programs"

Questions and Answers about Nursery Schools, National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, D.C.

Some Ways of Distinguishing a Good School or Center for Young Children, National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, D.C.

Licensing of Child Care Facilities by State Welfare Departments, HEW, 1968

Federal Inter-Agency Day Care Requirements, HEW and DOL, 23 September 1968

Parent Handbook, HEW Day Care Center, Thiokol Chemical Corporation

"Notes of Interview with Mr. Edward Wheeler, Director, HEW Day Care Center," prepared by Junior Officer Informal Study Group

HEW Day Care Center Registration Form and Informational Brochure

"Notes of Conversation with Mr. Edward Wheeler, Director, HEW Day Care Center, 15 February 1972," prepared by OP Day Care Committee

"Notes of Conversation with Robert Mott, Day Care Specialist, HEW Day Care Center, 15 February 1972," prepared by OP Day Care Committee

HEW Contract with Thiokol for Provision of Day Care Facilities